

FURTHER COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A
TYPE SPECIES FOR *PLEUROCERA* RAFINESQUE, 1818. Z.N.(S.) 83
(see vol. 33, pp. 105-113; vol. 34, pp. 196-199; vol. 36, pp. 139-146,
196-197)

By Y.I. Starobogatov (*Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences,
Leningrad, USSR*)

The name *Pleurocerus acutus* appeared in Blainville, 1824 (*Dict. Sci. nat.* vol. 32, p. 236) and, as stated by Dr Stein, is the same as *Pleurocera acuta* Rafinesque, 1831. We cannot attribute this specific name to Blainville because, as this author himself said, he had seen neither the animals nor the shell – in spite of the fact that Rafinesque had not mentioned the name previously. Consequently, *Pleurocerus* Rafinesque, in Blainville, 1824, is an erroneous subsequent spelling of *Pleurocera* Rafinesque, 1818, but the name *acutus* must be attributed to 'Rafinesque in Blainville, 1824'.

Two further species were added to the genus with available names in 1831 – *P. gonula* (p. 2) and *P. quadrosa* (p. 3).

I am strongly against all proposals to change the type species of *Pleurocera* and ask the Commission:

- (1) to place the generic name *Pleurocera* Rafinesque, 1818 (type species, by subsequent monotypy, *Pleurocera verrucosa* Rafinesque, 1820), on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;
- (2) to place on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology
 - (a) *verrucosa* Rafinesque, 1820, as published in the binomen *Pleurocera verrucosa*;
 - (b) *acuta* Rafinesque, 1831, as published in the binomen *Pleurocera acuta*.

In addition, I ask American malacologists to designate a neotype for *Pleurocerus oblongus* Rafinesque in Blainville, 1824, using for that purpose a specimen of *Pleurocera verrucosa*, in order to clarify the status of this name.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *LETHOCERUS*
MAYR, 1853 (INSECTA, HEMIPTERA). Z.N.(S.) 2161
(see vol. 35, pp. 236-238)

By I.M. Kerzhner (*Zoological Institute, Leningrad 199164, USSR*)

I fully support the proposal of Dr Menke. At the same time, I must point out that *Belostoma fakir* Gistel "[1847]", in Gistel & Bromme, *Handb. Naturges.*, 1850, p. 626, is a senior synonym of *Lethocerus cordofanus* Mayr, 1853. It is therefore the former name, not the latter, that should be placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology as the valid name of the type species of *Lethocerus*. I may add that the date "1850" on the title page of Gistel & Bromme's work appears to be correct.

L. cordofanus has generally been used for this species, as the following references show: Hoberlandt, 1954, *Acta ent. Mus. nat. Pragae* vol. 29, p. 145;

Jaczewski, 1936, *Ann. Mus. zool. Polon.* vol. 11, p. 190; Jordan, 1970, *Handb. Zool.* vol. 4(2), 2/20, p. 9; Linnavuori, 1960, *Ann. zool. Soc. Vanamo*, vol. 22, p. 51; 1964, *Ann. Zool. Fenn.* vol. 8, p. 355; Lundblad, 1933, *Arch. Hydrobiol.*, Suppl. 12, p. 52, and Dr Menke's own references to Lauck & Menke, 1961, Menke, 1960, 1963, and Popov, 1971. It would accordingly be possible to ask for the suppression of *Belostoma fakir* under the provisions of Articles 23a-b and 79b. However, Dr Menke has pointed out to me that the former Article says: 'A zoologist who considers that the application of the Law of Priority would in his judgment disturb stability . . . , and although *L. cordofanus* has been widely used in both taxonomic and non-taxonomic works, it scarcely qualifies for conservation by that means. The species is of no economic importance, and I accept Dr Menke's argument that *L. fakir* (Gistel) will quickly become established.

It must be remembered that the name *niloticus* Stål, 1855, was in general use for this species through the second half of the nineteenth century when *cordofanus* Mayr, 1853 was considered doubtful because given to a nymph. Even after Montandon and Kirkaldy rejected *niloticus* as a junior synonym of *cordofanus* in 1907-1909, both names continued to be used. The introduction of *fakir* will thus put an end to this confusion.

Editor's Note: Dr. Menke has written to say "I agree that *fakir* is the name to be put on the Official List. 3.3.80."

COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE REGARDING ICHNOTAXA. Z.N.(S.) 1973

By Richard G. Bromley and Franz T. Fürsich,
(*Institut for Historisk Geologi og Palaeontologi, Østervoldgade 10,
1350 København, Denmark*)

In its present form, the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN) does not provide for the nomenclature of ichnotaxa. Recent attempts by ichnologists to have the nomenclature of trace fossils recognized and protected by the ICZN have been outlined by Basan, 1979. The article by Melville, 1979, on paranomenclature now offers considerable hope for a step towards the stabilization of ichnotaxa. If the amendments to the ICZN that Mr. Melville proposes are accepted by the Commission, then several of the existing problems of ichnotaxonomy will be alleviated. However, there are some points in the proposed amendments to which ichnologists will take exception, and this would seem to be a suitable moment to air these matters, while there is still a possibility of adjusting the wording of the proposed new edition of the Code. It is hoped that the following comments will elucidate the ichnologist's special problems of nomenclature, a system that would seem to be further removed from zoological nomenclature than most zoologists realize.

PRINCIPLES OF ICHNOLOGY

2. Before going further, it will help to reiterate six of the principles of ichnology, since these have a direct bearing on the present discussion. (Their numbering herein is entirely for the purposes of this article.)